



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

of available information is small, but it is doubtful if an equal amount of modern literature would yield nearly as much information on the use of interpreters in the transaction of public and private business.

R.J.B.

---

*Epictetus, The Discourses and Manual together with Fragments of His Writings.* Translated with Introduction and Notes by P. E. MATHESON, M.A. Vols. I and II. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1916. Pp. 245.

This is an eminently readable translation, as I can testify from having heard it read aloud entire. By the same token it is correct. The few possible lapses are presumably intended freedoms and rarely if ever affect the sense. In i. 28 οὐ προσκόψει οὐδενί is hardly "offend none." In ii. 2 εὐδοκίμῃσις is I think more nearly "applause of the audience" than "ground of boasting." Cf. ii. 13 where εὐδοκιμῆσαι is rendered "to win a great name." In ii. 2. 16 οὐκ ἔχει λόγον is rather "takes no account of his judges" than "renders no account to his judges." In iii. 23. 4 even if we accept Schenkl's emendation εἰ ἐπεικῶς I doubt if it can be translated "at random." In iii. 23. 34 μάχην is I think "inconsistency," not "sordid struggle." In iv. 4. 15 ἐξ ἄπαντος is to be construed with the verb and cannot mean "always." But these are trifles.

Mr. Matheson has intentionally kept the style of his translation on a higher level of finish and fluency than Arrian claimed for his notes of Epictetus' homely discourse. In so doing he sometimes overlooks or purposely neglects some traits of the racy, idiomatic, popular diction that in the original blends not quite congruously with the terminology of Stoicism and the quotations from Plato and Chrysippus. Thus when Epictetus' schoolboy (ii. 21. 14) says that the baths are "rotten" (σαπρῶς λούει) Mr. Matheson preserves the literary proprieties with "shockingly bad." And Epictetus' colloquial repetition of κομψῶς and κομψός is disguised by a variety of dignified synonyms. In one instance this inappreciation of slang leads I think to positive misapprehension. A flatterer says to a lecturer (iii. 23. 19), "Δίῳνος οὐδέποτε ἤκουσαν τοσοῦτοι," "Dion never had so many hearers." The lecturer replies, "πόθεν αὐτῷ;" (not αὐτό) "καὶ κομψῶς αἰσθάνονται λόγων." "Where would he get 'em? And mine are some judges of eloquence too." Mr. Matheson renders, evidently reading αὐτό, "How is that? Why they have a fine turn for understanding arguments."

The appended list of quotations and references, though helpful, is, like Schenkl's footnotes, by no means complete. In i. 28. 4 and ii. 22. 36 πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἀκούσα στέρεται τῆς ἀληθείας (a favorite quotation of Marcus Aurelius and Emerson) there is no reference to Plato's Sophist 228c ἀλλὰ μὴν ψυχὴν

γε ἴσμεν ἀκούσαν πᾶσαν πᾶν ἀγνοοῦσαν. Douglas Sharp, *Epictetus and the New Testament*, p. 13, in his strange disquisition on this "Hellenistic idiom," is uncertain whether we are to understand the phrase as a quotation from Plato or not. Again, the interpretation and perhaps the text of iv. 1. 118-19 would have been cleared up by a reference to the doctrine of the *Lysis* that knowledge is the only justification of power or command and the paradox of the *Gorgias* that power to do wrong is not power.

PAUL SHOREY

---

*The Rhesus of Euripides.* Edited with Introduction and Notes by W. H. PORTER. Cambridge: University Press, 1916. Pp. lii+97.

Signs are not lacking of a revival of interest in the *Rhesus*. Mr. Porter's own examination of its genuineness in *Hermathena*, XVII (1913), 348-80, has now been continued by Professor Bates in *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, XLVII (1916), 5-11. The latter states (p. 5, n. 2) that Professor Rolfe has shifted his ground somewhat since his article on the subject in *Harvard Studies*, IV (1893), 61-97. The present editor devotes a generous portion of his Introduction to the problem (pp. xxxv-lii), but maintains that "the investigations of critics have failed to adduce any facts sufficient to warrant us in disregarding the testimony which assigns it to Euripides." An eagerness to relieve the barrenness of the fourth century by assigning an extant tragedy to that period has certainly been partly responsible for the critical assault upon the *Rhesus*. Yet any piece concerning which its defenders must grant that it "is a peculiar play: peculiar in style, peculiar in subject-matter, peculiar in treatment, peculiar for the suspicions cast upon it in ancient times," compels a certain reserve. The earlier pages of the Introduction are mainly occupied with a discussion, unusually fresh and interesting, of the "Plot and its Sources" (pp. x-xxxi). Steiger's interpretation of the tragedy's meaning is refuted in pages xxxi-xxxiii, the "Literary Significance of the Play."

The editor is largely indebted to Professor Gilbert Murray for the constitution of his text (p. vii and *passim* in the notes), for the theory that the *Rhesus* was a "pro-satyr drama, written by the youthful Euripides in imitation of Aeschylus and revised by another hand for reproduction after the poet's death (p. lii), for bits of translation (pp. xi, 56, 68, 84, 91, etc.), and for numerous other matters (pp. xv, xix, xxxiii, etc.).

When modern emendations have been introduced into the text, the MS readings are briefly recorded at the bottom of the page, even though such passages are regularly discussed at length in the commentary. Schröder's arrangement of the choral songs has been adopted. An appendix dealing with verses 874-78 has been contributed by Professor Norwood (pp. 91 f.).